

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The President's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me regarding the President's budget message with reference to natural resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

This is a budget which spells economic hardship and adversity for the Pacific Northwest.

Despite the urgent need for deepening the Columbia River bar to a depth of at least 48 feet, no funds are included for initiating this urgent project. The commerce and trade of Portland, Oregon's major port, are being choked by the shallow and dangerous shoals at the mouth of the Columbia.

The pledge of Federal assistance for new hydroelectric development is tied specifically to the discredited "partnership" scheme, under which private power companies would monopolize the bulk of revenues at the dams. This is a shotgun promise, telling the people of the region they must accept "partnership" or reconcile themselves to virtually no new projects at all.

In spite of the extravagant campaign promises made to the voters of southern Oregon by nearly every Republican candidate in the election of 1954, the Talent irrigation and power project in Jackson County receives not one cent in construction funds. Both Senator Morse and I urged Secretary McKay to honor his party's campaign promises to southern Oregon, but our plea has gone ignored.

The Bonneville Power Administration, which has been the lifeline of Northwest hydroelectric production, is to receive in the coming fiscal year only 66 percent of last year's budget. This symbolizes the gradual decline of Bonneville under the present administration, which hopes to see the great Federal agency superseded by private power companies.

Furthermore, the \$500,000 for advance engineering, which may go to John Day, does not even represent a full year's work under a normal program. I regret that the Governor of Oregon, who made many references to Congress in his inaugural message, never once recognized the fact that the budget is prepared wholly by the administration. Why was not the Oregon Legislature asked to urge upon the administration a budget which would do justice to Oregon?

It is alarming that the total sum to be spent on natural resources, which are the lifeblood of the Nation, is the lowest since 1950, amounting to \$953 million, as contrasted with \$1,358,000,000 in the 1953 fiscal year, for example.

Senator Morse and I will try to add to this budget some funds for such urgent Oregon undertakings as Columbia River deepening, the Talent project, an accelerated John Day Dam, and authorization and eventually construction of Hells Canyon.

The total disregard of the desperate need to deepen the Columbia bar to 48 feet is an

indication of the budget's inadequacy. For at least another year—unless we can amend this budget as it goes through Congress—Portland and Astoria will suffer in their competition with Puget Sound and California seaports.

Foreign and Defense Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD the text of the speech I made yesterday in Chicago, Ill., before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Foreign and defense policies are and need to be the people's business. The decisions that are made in the months ahead may well determine whether we are to have a free world of free men.

The wise men who drafted our Constitution knew well the history of the world up to their time.

They knew that where people had lost their freedom it was because of the concentration of power in one agency of the Government.

Not only did they set up three great co-equal branches of the Federal Government as checks and balances one against the other but they made the Federal Government one of limited and specified powers, reserving to the several States or the people thereof all other powers.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The times call for frankness and where there is an honest difference of opinion the American people should be presented the alternatives confronting them.

At the United Nations headquarters in New York a massive propaganda buildup is taking place to silence those who would analyze the facts of the recent visit of the Secretary General to Peiping. The same arguments for voluntary censorship will be used later when the ultimate price of ransom is paid—lest we offend the killers in Peiping.

The Chinese Communist regime is the same one which committed the aggression in Korea; was responsible for inflicting 140,000 casualties upon us, including 35,000 dead. That regime also killed in cold blood hundreds of Americans, with hands tied behind their backs, who were their prisoners.

It is the same regime which has consistently violated the Korean armistice and has prevented the neutral nations investigative teams from being anything but paralyzed, impotent examples of the free world's naive trust in a system which prides itself in treachery, assassination, and dishonor as legitimate weapons in the ultimate communization of the world.

Lest there be some who think I am not being slow to anger I will quote Lenin who

said, "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, lawbreaking, withholding and concealing truth."

Communism is a global menace. It cannot be stopped in Europe if allowed free reign in Asia. Lenin stated the basic concept when he said, "The road to Paris is through Peking."

In this age of the airplane and atomic power this Nation could no more return to isolation than an adult could return to childhood.

We need and want stout allies but an alliance must be a two-way affair. A nation cannot buy friends any more than can an individual.

The mission of Secretary General Hammarskjöld was not a success and, in my judgment, no service is done the American people or those of the free world by pretending that it was.

Mr. Hammarskjöld has returned without either the release of the prisoners of war held in violation of the armistice agreement or any prospective date in the future when they will be freed. He personally favors the admission of Communist China into the United Nations and his government has recognized that regime. In China he did not go to see our men and the conditions under which they are imprisoned. His mission was a failure by any fair standard or yardstick that Americans can use.

This is attempted to be glossed over by the statement that "When tensions are eased the members of our Armed Forces may be released." We already know the standards which the Communist Government has set for the easing of tensions. They are:

1. The admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

2. Reopening of trade, including that of strategic materials with Communist China.

3. The reversal of the American policy which holds that it is not in our national interest or that of the free world to have the island of Formosa, with its 9½ million free Chinese, pass into Communist hands.

4. A reversal of our determination and of the free world to draw a line in the Pacific so that additional nations and their people will not pass behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

These surrenders will not be apparent all at once and for the most part, if accomplished, would be done despite the negative vote of the United States.

But first there will come the concessions which like paying other types of blackmail will be constantly enlarged:

1. Assurances to the Chinese Communists relating to limitations and restrictions upon our pending treaty with the Republic of China, now on Formosa, and other offshore islands.

This, I would point out to Mr. Hammarskjöld, is a dangerous game. The Chinese and North Korean Communists had understood from Mr. Acheson that the Republic of Korea was outside of our defense perimeter.

2. Assurances that while public opinion in the United States would not presently support Chinese Communist admission into the United Nations the Communist bloc and the neutrals would soon reward the Peiping regime for their generosity in releasing a fraction of our citizens held provided the American voice at home and abroad was throttled from telling the truth regarding the tyranny spreading its cancerous growth in Asia, Europe, and anywhere else they can subvert free nations.

Mr. Hammarskjöld knows as well as does any other observer of the world scene that

in Communist eyes there will be no lessening of tensions until the Communists are appeased in that manner.

What a vast difference the history books would record today if the men who gave us our Nation had not been prepared to take some risks. We would never have become or remained an independent free America.

How long can such a policy be followed without ending in disaster for ourselves as well as the other member states of the United Nations?

Our power was so diluted by the United Nations during the Korean action that the recommendations of our responsible military commanders were constantly vetoed or ignored and our joint venture prevented the winning of the Korean conflict.

The United Nations record in Korea was not effective security in action. The United States furnished 90 percent of the manpower. Only 17 out of 60 members supplied any manpower at all. We supplied 450,000 in armed forces to 45,000 supplied by all other United Nations members.

Soviet chairmanship of the Security Council at intervals during the Korean war was like having the town arsonist to head the fire department. The Soviet Union admitted supplying arms, ammunition and moral support to the aggressor.

Will the same joint venture prevent us from securing the release of our own men in the uniform of the American Armed Forces without paying tribute to the Chinese Communist regime?

Before Mr. Hammarskjöld and his associates at New York or their home governments commit themselves to appeasement in conformity with the current Communist line let them understand: Any such appeasement will be subjected not only to the most searching scrutiny by the American Congress but by a far more potent solemn referendum of the American people in 1956.

The time may be coming in the not too distant future when the people of the United States may have to insist upon a second Declaration of Independence.

We did not change from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to the great Nation of 165 million because we had the most people in the world. There have been a good many other nations that have had larger populations.

We did not reach our present place because we had the most resources in the world, for there are other nations which have greater material resources.

I believe that we came to our present position of leadership because the founders of this Republic gave us a heritage of courage and a written Constitution that, better than any other document drafted by man, has given to our people the freedom—political and economic—without which this great progress could not have been made.

In this atmosphere the American spirit had free reign. We were guaranteed the right to worship God, each according to his beliefs.

To be sure, we have demonstrated time and time again that as a nation and as a people we are indeed slow to anger.

The religion and cultural background of the free people of China made them slow to anger. Their nation is today behind the Iron Curtain and millions have been liquidated, including men of religion, teachers, small merchants, businessmen, and non-Communist workers and farmers. The free people of Czechoslovakia were slow to anger, and are today behind the Communist Iron Curtain—though in the preceding election less than 20 percent of their people had voted the Communist ticket.

Some of our associates abroad apparently want to brainwash us of some of the history that has made America great.

But, there comes a time, as my old New England grandmother used to say, when we reach a point of righteous indignation, and

out of this has come—cherished to each American generation, one succeeding the other—such terms as: "Give me liberty or give me death," "Don't give up the ship," "Remember the Alamo," "Damn the torpedoes; full speed ahead," "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Despite the fact that in many instances we were faced with what appeared to be overwhelming odds, we have never found it necessary to sacrifice our national honor when a vital principle was at stake.

Nor must we ever permit any international organization to so dilute or undermine our spirit to the extent that Gulliver becomes chained by the Lilliputians and we are unable to even protect our own.

The United Nations overwhelmingly passed a resolution giving support to the American position relative to the 15 American airmen being illegally held by the Chinese Communists.

While the Communists have acknowledged that they hold these 15 men in uniform, there are strong grounds for belief that they may be holding other unaccounted for Americans. During the Korean war there were more than 800 unaccounted for Americans in uniform who had fallen into Communist hands. We also know that they have 28 American civilian citizens still in Communist jails, many of them having served there for 3 or 4 years. We know some of these have been in leg and arm chains for months at a time.

This Nation will want to know what additional steps the United Nations will promptly take to secure the release of the uniformed personnel? How long are we expected to be patient while our men are in Communist cells?

Are they prepared to apply against the Chinese Communist regime economic sanctions as well as moral condemnation by resolution? If these are not successful, are they prepared to support a tight naval and air blockade upon the China coast?

Or is the plan to silence Members of Congress, have a form of censorship over our press, radio, and television, hush our people into a sense of false security lest it offend the Communist leader at Peiping who as successor to the emperors of the old middle kingdom expects the representatives of the free world to kow tow and bring tribute to his august presence?

Since when did it become sound policy to reward the gangster with the Legion of Merit because he returns a part of his loot?

In the final analysis, however, neither the American Government nor the Congress can escape the responsibility for taking whatever effective steps are necessary to secure the release of these men wearing the uniform of this country. They do not wear the uniform of the United Nations though they did serve in the United Nations operation in Korea. As long as a single American is held in a Communist prison I shall not remain silent.

Some, though not all, of our present problems vis-a-vis the Communist world stem from the secret agreements of Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

We should not consider all the people behind the Iron Curtain as being enemies of the free way of life.

At a matter of fact the people of Russia were the first victims of Communist tyranny from which we may hope they will some day be free.

Without the knowledge or consent of either the American people or their elected representatives in the Congress commitments were made for the postwar period which enabled the Communist conspiracy to gain control of Eastern Europe, China, and North Korea.

Since the year 1945, which saw the end of World War II in Europe and Asia, international communism has made great strides.

In January of that year there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Today, just 10 years later, there are over 800 million. The world's balance of power has been upset.

When 30 years ago Lenin said "The road to Paris is through Peking," he meant that China was the key to all of Asia with its billion and a half people. Once consolidated with the manpower and resources of Asia communism could turn with overwhelming power against the West.

Peace with honor is, and should be, the policy of the American people. This is certainly far different from a policy of peace at any price. Unless this is thoroughly understood, we could be lured into a sense of false security by the words of the men in the Kremlin which do not conform to their actions or their policies.

We must never lose sight of the fact that communism is the most brutal, Godless tyranny the world has ever known. As a temporary expedient they may change their day-to-day tactics, but their long-term strategy remains the same under Malenkov as it was under Lenin and Stalin.

Some time between 1913 and 1915 Lenin studied the works of Karl von Clausewitz, who is rated as one of the outstanding theoreticians of war. Clausewitz' statement that the conqueror always pretends to be peace loving because he would like to attain his objectives in a bloodless fashion (as, indeed, does the bank robber who kills only when resisted or disturbed in carrying out his mission) and that, therefore, aggression must be presented as a defensive reaction of the attacking nation was considered by Lenin to be a good idea. This idea is still at the bottom of Communist pacifist propaganda—peaceful coexistence.

The Kremlin's basic strategy is that communism will dominate the world, and free institutions and enterprise as we know them will be destroyed. Neither as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee nor as a party leader in the Senate has the slightest reliable evidence been presented to me which would demonstrate that the Communist leopard has changed its spots.

We and the free world must not allow ourselves to be paralyzed while nation after nation in Asia and in Europe is brought behind the Communist Iron Curtain. In such an event we might ultimately find ourselves as an isolated island of freedom in an otherwise totalitarian world.

Under such conditions, though the difficulties would be great, we might exist as sort of a continental Dien Bien Phu. However, we would not be able to maintain the same political or economic system which has enabled this country of ours to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a world power of 165 million, the most productive industrially and agriculturally the world has ever known.

The doctrine of peaceful coexistence is being advanced by the men in the Kremlin, by the neutralist nations which do not desire to take sides as between freedom and slavery and by some of our people who have not necessarily understood the full implications of what the Communists mean by peaceful coexistence.

Their basic policy is and has been that they would permit a nation to peacefully coexist for such a time as suited the Kremlin's convenience and until they could either be subverted by communism from within or taken over by Communist aggression from without. They have in mind for us the peaceful coexistence the Thanksgiving turkey has (well fed and housed) until the axe falls.

Whatever their station in political economic or academic circles, those who lose sight of this basic fact endanger the freedom of this Republic and the hope of gaining or preserving a free world of free men. You could, of course, always buy temporary

respite by a policy of appeasement, but the world should have learned at the time of Munich that "the road to appeasement is not the road to peace." It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Proposals almost certain to be made if and when a big four conference is held:

1. Recognition and approval of the present borders of the Iron Curtain.
2. Communist China in the United Nations.

This would mean the perpetual slavery of hundreds of millions of people without hope of ultimate freedom. It would mean a complete repudiation of the doctrine of liberation.

On November 15 in the Senate of the United States, in discussing coexistence, I raised a number of questions. They were:

"Are 'coexistence' and 'atomic stalemate' synonymous terms? If they are not, just what is the difference? Is the former merely an inevitable prelude to the latter? And what of our foreign policy and our defense policy when such an atomic stalemate takes place? Does not atomic stalemate mean inevitable Communist nibbling aggression, rather than peace in our time? How many years remain when we still have some initiative left? These are some of the basic questions before the Government and the people of the United States."

These questions have not as yet been fully explored. They will be during the present session of the 84th Congress. Without partisanship or factionalism we must face up to the facts and the challenges of our generation.

If we will only show the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in Philadelphia and, under divine inspiration, gave us first the Declaration of Independence and then the Constitution of the United States, there are none of our domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

The National Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by me in regard to the national highway program as submitted by the National Advisory Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA, RELATIVE TO THE CLAY COMMISSION HIGHWAY REPORT

I shall discuss the proposed new road plan at length in the Senate when the President submits it to Congress January 27. In this statement I am commenting briefly on the recommendations to the President by the National Advisory Committee for a national highway program.

The Committee's recommendations fall generally in two parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of \$623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional \$25 billion for the so-called interstate highway system. Federal expenditures on the 2 programs in 10 years would total \$31 billion. Including the interest, the expenditure will be \$42.5 billion.

The Committee estimates the \$25 billion would construct 40,000 road-miles designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. This would be little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. The average would be about 800 miles per State. For this the Committee recommends borrowing \$20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of \$5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the Committee can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule—the last maturing in 1987—the interest would cost more than \$11.5 billion. At this rate every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers \$1.55.

Based on all recent Federal experience, I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period.

It may be expected that even before the 40,000 miles are constructed, the program will be expanded in mileage, scope, and amount. It is certain that the system will be thousands of miles greater than contemplated in the Committee report.

As we grow, population shifts, and the impact on specific roads changes, and therefore our road needs shift and change. There is no such thing as a permanent road because no one can predict years in advance what specific roads will carry the most traffic.

Actually the Committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60-40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are unique so far as I know, and thoroughly unsound.

The Committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow \$20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to \$5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction.

This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs.

When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from

classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition. The obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens will still remain.

There is another grave objection to this Federal road plan, of importance equal to those I have mentioned.

GROWTH OF FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES

Since 1934, Federal grants to States have enormously expanded in cost and functions. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the States. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things that they did not desire to do, because of grants made by the Federal Government.

The growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was \$126 million, for 18 grants-in-aid programs. Now the total of Federal grants is \$3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost. Federal grants to States never end. They continue to expand.

The Committee's proposal contemplates the greatest increase in Federal grants suggested. A Federal agency will determine the location of the interstate road system, will fix the number and location of access roads, which may be considerable distances apart, will fix the fees for the activities such as filling stations, motels, restaurants, etc., that are located along the rights-of-way and will control construction standards, etc.

No one recognizes more fully than I the need of road improvement to meet the constantly increasing impact of modern-day traffic. A great deal of my public career has been devoted to the problems of a road construction in Virginia. As a substitute for the Committee's recommendations I propose:

1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems which, for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to \$535 million.

3. That the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

4. A $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; \$11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

Under the Committee plan principal and interest payments on the \$20 billion bond issue would dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, with the exception of about \$600 million which is committed to matching funds of States for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

In the next few days I will present on a yearly basis figures showing the plan I propose will result in more road development

than can be accomplished under the Committee's plan; that it will avoid increasing the public debt, and that it will serve to preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system.

Conservation of Soil: Our Greatest Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I delivered at the National Agriculture Limestone Institute in Washington at noon today.

On this occasion, I spoke on the subject Conservation of Soil: Our Greatest Resource. If we are to preserve our productive capacity we must conserve our soil. We should ever remember the lesson of China, where neglect of natural resources contributed to impoverishment of its people, political instability, and social discontent. Such an example should teach us we cannot continually mine our resources without replenishment, that to do so would invite national disaster. We should remember that it can happen to us.

President Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress on the state of the Union, said we must direct greater attention to the needs of low-income farm families. Many of these farmers are being strangled slowly by intense competition in the farm markets today. They constitute the group leaving the farm today, causing a reduction in family-size farms.

A properly financed, continuously adequate soil-conservation program, with prominent roles for lime and fertilizer, would enable these farmers to produce better quality crops in greater quantity, and permit them to compete more effectively with lower cost producers.

A betterment of his economic position would make farming more attractive to the low-income farmers and help keep them down on the farm. Further, the farmer's welfare is integrally bound to the Nation's welfare. He is a big buyer of finished steel products, oil, and chemical supplies. If we are to maintain a balance between agriculture and industry we should bend every effort to make farming a healthy, attractive, and thriving business.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANK CARLSON, OF KANSAS, AT NATIONAL AGRICULTURE LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, STATLER HOTEL, TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it is a genuine privilege and a real honor to speak to the delegates and members of the National Agriculture Limestone Institute at its annual meeting. Your organization is representative of an industry that means much to the national welfare and the well-being of the American farmers.

It is most appropriate that I discuss with you the subject Conservation of Soil: Our Greatest Resource.

Your interests are not confined to soil conservation, but you have a direct and personal interest in the international and economic problems of the Nation.

I trust you will pardon me if I refer back to the Old Testament and use a verse of scripture as a text:

"And there saw we the giants, the sons of Anak, which come of the giants: and we were as grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight." (Numbers 13: 33.)

These giants stand out as symbols of great difficulties—great obstacles. They are in every field of our activities. We meet them in our international problems—we meet them in our domestic problems—certainly we meet them in the field of agriculture. We must overcome them or they will overcome us.

Fortunately, our Nation has been blessed with men and women who had vision, great courage and an overcoming faith.

Two giants or obstacles in agriculture have been and are agriculture surpluses and production restrictions.

The stress of reduced demand during the depression years and the necessity for downward readjustments in agricultural output at the end of World War II have forced us to think a great deal about these two problems.

But as a long-run solution, acreage control of production of food, raw fibers, and the other products of our agricultural industry is as distasteful to the American mind as the restriction of output by an industrial monopolist would be.

Our greatest hope for the permanent solution of both the surplus and restriction problems thus lies in the direction of expanded consumption at home and abroad. Given sufficient time and a realistic approach to the problem of existing surpluses and the need for acreage diversions to prevent their continued accumulation, we can grow up to our present capacity.

It is entirely possible that within the not-too-distant future, instead of worrying about curtailment, we may be having to think and plan for increasing agricultural production even in peacetimes, just as we have had to do several times during war periods in the past.

When one considers the prospects of our working out of these surpluses and the surplus productive capacity from which they come, four points come to mind:

1. We are faced with a tremendous growth in demand resulting from an unprecedented increase in population.

2. We can hope and expect a continually rising standard of living for all these people.

3. With modern technology and research at work for us, there is almost no limit to the possible new uses and hence new demands for agricultural products which may be discovered.

4. Even though the export market for agricultural commodities has declined in recent years, there are still millions of underfed, underclothed peoples of the world who are anxious and willing to buy our products if they can find or be helped to find ways to pay for them.

Population growth, if we look far enough ahead, will alone have a tremendous impact upon the surplus problem. Population which today is 163 million is estimated at 190 million in 1965.

Within the next decade we shall thus be faced with substantially the situation which an excellent Department of Agriculture report, issued only a few years ago, entitled "The Fifth Plate," foresaw for 1975.

For every four people sitting down to a meal and consuming the products of agriculture today there will be another person, a fifth mouth, to be fed at the dinner table 10 and 15 years from now. While the figures on the rate of population increase have been

variously presented, each time new estimates are made the earlier estimates seem to appear more and more conservative.

If all of us are to eat as well of pork products a decade hence as we have been doing, agriculture will have not only to produce as it did in 1950, but an additional amount equal to all of the pigs produced in Iowa and Nebraska in 1950.

If we are to do no more than maintain our per capita beef consumption, we will have to add to our national production an amount equivalent to the entire 1950 production of the great producing States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Minnesota combined.

With no increase whatever in lamb consumption per capita, we will need somehow to increase production by an amount greater than that of the combined production of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

On this population count alone, it looks like our surplus problem may, in due time, give way to one of trying to make every 5 of our present acres produce as much as 6 acres do today. That will call for larger and larger dosages of capital in the form of lime, fertilizers, better seeds and machinery, together with improved farming practices generally.

Incidentally, the report already referred to notes that we can build up acres by using lime and that the tons spread during the agricultural conservation program in the single year 1949 resulted in 20 million tons more hay and pasture forage which, if converted to beef, would equal 1½ billion pounds live weight.

In our great concern for the problems of this agricultural surplus era there is a danger that we may overlook other important phases of our agricultural policies and programs. We should be careful in our thinking not to deemphasize the agricultural conservation programs. We must be ever aware of our duty to preserve the Nation's soils for future generations in a sound and adequate manner even during this period of temporary surpluses.

Only a few years ago we exerted every effort to increase production of practically all crops to meet demand. Who can say the same situation won't face us again a few years from now? Our conservation efforts must remain on a level consistent with the needs of our soil today and in the years to come if we are to faithfully discharge our obligation to the welfare of our farmers and city dwellers today and to those yet unborn.

In addition to the growth in population, we all look forward to a continually rising standard of living for those who make up that population. And a rising standard of living means in part improved diets for those at every income level.

While Americans today are on the average the best-fed people in the world, we cannot be content with present standards. The whole trend in income distribution is certain to be such that those who must now live on restricted or inadequate diets will be enabled to raise their standards and partake of more and more healthful foods.

As costs of producing various crops are realigned, the grains which in the short run present embarrassing surpluses may well be applied to greater uses as animal feed. Our increased population and our rising standard of living will call for increased consumption of meats which is one sure way of cutting into our recent cereal surpluses.

The third outlook which we may expect to help minimize our surplus problem over the years ahead lies in the development of new uses and new demands for agricultural products. New and better uses for our crops present several aspects all moving forward simultaneously.

By lowering the costs of production and distribution of established crops through technology, new markets are constantly being tapped. The discovery of wholly new products and wholly new uses for established

farm crops is another way in which demand for the products of our farms can be increased.

Still another front lies in the development of new crops, thereby facilitating the acreage shifts necessary to reduce production in some of the older crops, such as wheat and cotton, which are currently in surplus.

The constant trend toward lower agricultural costs by improved strains and the utilization of wastes makes it increasingly possible to sell agricultural raw materials in competition with other materials in their fields.

It is not necessary to illustrate each of these types. It is only necessary to recall the shifts in acreage made possible by the expanding industrial uses for soybean oil.

Back in 1924 American farmers harvested just under 5 million bushels of soybeans. In 1954 our soybean production was a record-breaking 343 million bushels, with a market value of nearly \$1 billion. Thus in the short space of three decades we have seen the development of a new major crop in this country and with it a new major industry.

We need only recall the expanded demand for products resulting from development of freezing and dehydrating processes, and such things as the spectacular use of hulls from rolled oats to produce furfural as a selective solvent used in the petroleum industry and as a raw material in the manufacture of chemical intermediates.

Who shall say what the future limitations may be upon our national development? In agriculture, what new crops will tomorrow bring? What new uses for old crops? In a world just now entering the atomic age, some of the most exciting laboratories ever known to man may be right on our farms.

While corn is not one of our surplus problems, the possibilities of readjustment are demonstrated in the shift from corn to new resistant combine grain sorghums in the southern great plains States and in central and western Kansas.

As an outgrowth of experiments conducted at the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the Kansas Industrial Commission, new types of hulling and milling equipment now permit the manufacture of flour and livestock feeds from grain sorghum, the flour being widely used in making gypsum lath or wallboard.

Varieties and suitabilities of grain sorghum have meanwhile been improved by research, giving further impetus to the search for new uses of products and byproducts.

It was reported a few years ago that new industrial uses for grain sorghum had already provided added outlets for the crop from 2 million acres. The expansion would doubtless be even more dramatic if we had the later figures.

Last but not least among the ways which promise to help us work out from under agricultural surpluses is increased agricultural exports.

Export markets have long been vital to our farm population. These export markets have unfortunately suffered in recent years and would certainly have fallen off considerably more had it not been for our foreign aid programs.

As the President observed in his January 10, 1955, message on foreign economic policy, "no single group in America has a greater stake in a healthy and expanding foreign trade than the farmers."

During the recent year there has been some improvement in the export of farm crops, but during the past few years, agriculture has suffered a serious decline in the loss of foreign markets for farm products.

During the years 1951 to 1953, we lost the export markets for farm crops produced on 20 million acres of our farmland. The crops that suffered most from this loss of export markets were wheat and cotton.

The value of the farm crops exported for the years 1952 and 1953 declined from over

\$4 billion to \$2,800,000,000, or a decline of 31 percent.

The average value of farm exports during the past 5 years has been \$3,500,000,000.

The last session of Congress provided for a program of disposal of farm products under Public Law 480. This law authorized by the last Congress, provides for the disposal of \$1 billion worth of farm surpluses during a period of 3 years.

It is estimated that during the fiscal year ending next June 30, we will have sold or given away abroad under this program \$578 million worth of surplus farm products.

This program is functioning well and much credit must be given to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, for the zeal with which he is pursuing it.

The long-run potentialities of foreign markets may be illustrated by the case of cotton, one of the products which in recent years has tended to be in surplus.

With a rapidly growing world population, there is no question that a need exists abroad for all of the cotton that can be produced in the United States, as well as in the countries which have lately become our competitors in this field of agricultural production. Per capita consumption of cotton in 1948 was, for example, 3.3 pounds in Asia, 6.2 pounds in Latin America, and 7.5 pounds in Europe, compared to 28 pounds in the United States.

Granting all that may be said about the increasing role of synthetic substitutes, it is still true that if per capita consumption of other parts of the world were brought up anywhere near levels prevailing in the United States, surpluses such as that of cotton might well give way to shortages.

The key to future exportation of more agricultural products is, of course, essentially a matter of imports. We ought not to hope to solve our agricultural problems permanently by aid programs, dumping, or giving away excesses.

The potential foreign buyers must be permitted to earn the wherewithal to pay for the grains and fibers which they need and would buy.

The problem of international trade and the making of reciprocal trade agreements is one that requires the most diligent study—keeping in mind the interests of agriculture, industry, and labor.

The President has submitted a program calling for an extension of the Executive authority to negotiate tariff reductions, the easing of customs administrative burdens, and steps to encourage United States investment abroad, as measures that should contribute to an expanded trade with foreign countries.

Action will be taken on this program in this session of Congress and as a member of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, I hope to be helpful in writing a program that will give agriculture its proportionate share of the agricultural export market. The farmers are asking no more, and they are entitled to no less.

All of the ways I have discussed for increasing demand for our farm products will be reduced to empty talk if the soils of our country are not maintained in a condition which will help us produce to meet demand in years to come.

I am as concerned as anyone else over our surplus problem but for one additional and all-important reason—that our preoccupation with it will obscure the ever-present necessity to constantly maintain and increase our soil-conservation efforts.

We must step back from the individual trees and look at the entire forest—we must view the problems and values of soil conservation in proper perspective.

In discussing a conservation program we should not think of it so much as benefiting this or that class of farmers or that only certain groups of farmers deserve to participate. We are dealing here with a program

in which the entire Nation—every man, woman, and child—has a stake. For the soil of our Nation is a large part of our real wealth—our strength in a day and time sorely in need of such strength.

Our soil has contributed immeasurably to our country's prosperity, to the health of its people, to the creation of the economic giant we are in the world today and to the universal prestige we hold because of our economic power. We believe our way of life represents a force for good in this world; the productive power of our soil and our industrial might have elevated us to world leadership and have given us an opportunity to influence, by our position, the rest of the world to a way of life which would mean peace and progress.

Considering soil conservation within this frame, who can say an appropriation of \$200 million or \$500 million or more is enough to accomplish an objective so interwoven with the welfare of this Nation?

It is disheartening to me to find so much emphasis being placed on the saving of dollars in connection with our soil-conservation program. Mere saving of dollars is false economy if this practice becomes a habit and our soil deteriorates to the point where it threatens our productive capacity and ultimately far greater expense becomes necessary in order to rebuild the fertility level.

Economy is important but in soil conservation, as perhaps in national defense, there are other values to consider. It is easy to say that so many billions of dollars can be trimmed from the defense budget. On the other hand, can anyone say positively that twice the expenditure isn't needed in view of the fast-changing race for the latest weapons of destruction?

Today we hear about the imminent possibility of intercontinental missiles which can destroy cities in a matter of minutes. When this becomes a reality the sums we are spending for defense today may be paltry in comparison with the outlays we may have to make.

The same may be said for soil conservation. The consequences of continually chipping away at appropriations for this vital program could be ghastly to behold in years to come.

If we could only visualize the specter of ruin which would face our farm communities and the resultant threat to our economy as a whole following in the wake of neglected and inadequately financed soil conservation practices we would not be so anxious to save dollars alone. We should conserve the real wealth of the Nation—the soil—and not so much the dollars that merely measure value.

In a sense the surplus era upon us gives us an opportunity to produce better quality crops. With fewer acres in production we can concentrate on greater and more intelligent applications of lime and fertilizer, producing higher quality crops in substantial quantity and at a reduced real cost.

There is another area in which an adequate soil conservation effort can be helpful in the maintenance of a strong agriculture. For many years farm population has been steadily declining. In 1800 about 75 percent of our total population tilled the soil; today less than 20 percent make a living from the soil.

President Eisenhower, in his recent message to Congress on the state of the Union, said we must direct greater attention to the needs of low-income farm families. Many of these farmers are being strangled slowly by intense competition in the farm markets today. They constitute the group leaving the farm today, causing a reduction in family-size farms.

A properly financed, continuously adequate soil conservation program with prominent roles for lime and fertilizer would enable these farmers to produce better quality crops

in greater quantity and permit them to compete more effectively with lower cost producers.

A betterment of his economic position would make farming more attractive to the low-income farmer and help keep them "down on the farm." Further, the farmer's welfare is integrally bound to the Nation's welfare. He is a big buyer of finished steel products, oil, and chemical supplies. If we are to maintain a balance between agriculture and industry, we should bend every effort to make farming a healthy, attractive, and thriving business.

The condition of the Nation's soil determines the quality of food products grown. Since we are what we eat, the fertility level of our soils has a direct bearing on the state of our health. Of the 4 forces determining the nutritious quality of food plants grown—air, sunshine, water, and soil—only 2, water and soil, are considered variable.

To the extent that we can control our water resources and the chemical components of our soil we will control the nutritive value of crops grown. When our soil becomes deficient in calcium, nitrogen, and other elements the deficiency shows up in crops and livestock.

These mineral-lacking food products give us a poorly balanced diet affecting our health. We cannot afford the chance that our soil would deteriorate to the point of endangering our health. We should remember that a nation is only as strong as the backbone of its people.

If we are to preserve our productive capacity we must conserve our soil. We should ever remember the lesson of China where neglect of natural resources contributed to impoverishment of its people, political instability, and social discontent. Such an example should teach us we cannot continually mine our resources without replenishment—that to do so would invite national disaster. We should remember that it can happen to us.

Address Delivered by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at the New York Democratic State Committee Victory Dinner

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of an address which I made at the victory dinner of the New York State Democratic Committee, at the Waldorf Astoria in New York City, last Friday evening, January 14.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After 12 long years, we have again known victory in New York State. And all present evidence indicates that New Yorkers are pleased with what they did on November 2, and approve of the manner in which the men and women elected and selected for high office have gone about meeting the problems with which New York is faced.

We meet tonight to do honor to the men and women who led us to victory: the candidates and the hundreds and thousands of others at the county, district, and precinct levels—those who are here tonight and those

who are not. We salute them all—the leaders and the foot soldiers of the Democratic Party. And let us not forget our friends of the Liberal Party, too, and those independents who belong to no political party, but to the party of good government.

As most of you know, it was my privilege to play an active part in the recent campaign. I had my heart as much set on victory last fall as in any other campaign in which I have taken part, either as a candidate or as an advocate. And I have participated in almost all of them, over the past 30 years. I am proud and glad for any contribution I was able to make to the election of Adrian Burke, Arthur Leavitt, George DeLuca, and Averell Harriman.

I am happy to know that the chair I had the great honor of occupying during 4 terms as Governor of this State is now filled by that distinguished American, that fine Democrat, whom I have long known as an old friend and outstanding public figure, Averell Harriman.

I am confident that he will add luster to the high traditions of the Democratic Governors of New York.

But as we rejoice in our success of last November and at the fact that our party now controls the State administration, let us pause and reflect on some of the implications of the event of 2 months ago.

Political victory is not an end in itself, although sometimes it has a regrettable tendency to become so. At the terminus of political victory is the beginning of responsibility. The test of victory is how we utilize it. It is one thing to command success. It is another to deserve it.

The people, the voters of New York, will sit in final judgment on the manner in which the responsibility now given our party is discharged. From here on our accounting is not within the party, but with the people.

We must account for the manner in which campaign pledges are discharged. We must account for the manner in which day-to-day actions are taken, and day-to-day decisions are made.

We must prove to the people that the pledges made during the campaign, and the platform agreed upon by the party and subscribed to by our candidates were seriously meant and will be redeemed.

If our leaders and officeholders will be guided by these rules of conduct, and I am sure they will be, our party, which is on trial before the people, will be judged worthy of responsibility and deserving of victory, both in the past and in the future.

The challenge we face as a party in New York State has a striking similarity with, and relationship to, the challenge we have taken up as a party in the Nation.

In Washington, we have assumed not executive but legislative responsibility.

But the basic requirement is the same, to discharge that responsibility in a manner which the people will judge worthy of the trust placed in us last November.

In Washington and in the Nation, as in New York State, too, there is within our ranks a strong sense of party unity. And a basic party unity is, of course, greatly to be desired in preparation for the great victory that beckons us in 1956, for in that year win we must and win we shall.

In November 1956 we are going to put an end to the giveaway regime, to the regime of bluster and blunder, of compromise and surrender, of privileges for the few and sacrifices for the many.

We are fortunately rich in leaders who can take us to victory in 1956, although my own preference has been and remains that great and eloquent apostle and leader of liberal democracy, Adlai Stevenson.

Yes, we will have party unity in 1956, and we will win in 1956. But our party unity must be based on principle. Let us beware of making party unity an end in itself, or of

decreeing and enforcing it at the expense of basic principle.

The Democratic Party nationwide, as in New York State, is strong enough, and broad enough, to give shelter to differing views and to tolerate minority opinions, from both the right and the left, on even the most critical subjects. From the pull and haul of honest differences within a party comes political scope, development and vitality.

Let us not make a false or fatal confusion between party unity and party responsibility. A political party has an inescapable responsibility to facilitate, by every appropriate means, the practical fulfillment by party officeholders of the pledges and undertakings made by the party and its candidates at election time. A party has the duty to urge and induce its officeholders to abide by party principles and platform commitments and to justify to the public those departures which are made by reason of clearly demonstrated need.

But there is no warrant to throttle or stifle minority views, based on principle, within the party, or to discourage access to the free market place of ideas for the airing of party differences. Differences on public issues within the party can and should be met forthrightly and with forbearance. The final arbiter in such matters will be the people.

I recognize the necessity of being politically practical and realistic. It is important to get things done as well as to talk about getting them done. The encouragement of party unity as a means of making real progress in legislation and administration is clearly desirable. And often, it is better to take one step at a time, rather than none at all, and to walk slowly, when running proves impossible.

But let us never sacrifice, or try to justify the sacrifice, of essential principle on the altar of political expediency, and surely not when the object of the sacrifices is the false god of rigid party unity.

At the end of that road lies corruption of political integrity, and, instead of victory, only disaster and political repudiation.

Let me make clear that I am not attacking a present situation; I am only warning against a danger, a tendency which shows itself today as no more than a cloud the size of a man's hand on the horizon of our recent victory in the congressional elections.

The Democratic Party is the liberal party of the Nation. That is its tradition and its justification for being. The Democratic Party has been victorious in New York State and in the Nation only when it has stood by its traditions, and with outstanding candidates, has offered a clear program of liberalism to the people.

With specific reference to the Democratic Party of New York State, its role in the Nation is clear and unmistakable.

Its function is to cast its full weight—the weight of the 15 million people of this State—on the side of liberalism and progress within the Democratic Party.

Its role is to fight for liberal principles and liberal candidates for submission to the Nation as a whole.

I am confident that the Democratic Party of New York will continue to fulfill this function in the months and years ahead.

We must continue to battle ceaselessly for the principles of humanitarianism, for equal civil and political rights for all, for the development and conservation of our natural resources in the interests of the consumers and of all the people, for special consideration of the needs of the underprivileged, and for the advancement of the economic interests of the consumer, the worker, the farmer, and the small businessman. We must fight unyieldingly for freedom, and the practices of liberty.

These must be our banners, in domestic affairs, and we must irresistibly uphold and advance them.

Surely we will go forward, under these banners, to victory in 1956, and to another and even greater victory, in New York State, in 1958. Just as surely we will fail if we compromise these principles or surrender them, in the name of political expediency.

We have had a fine victory in the State and in the Nation. Now we must redouble our efforts and develop to the utmost our resources of imagination, of courage, and of leadership. With God's help we will succeed in our purposes, to the greater credit of the Democratic Party, to the greater welfare of our people, and to the greater glory of America.

United States Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday night it was my pleasure to deliver an address on the subject of United States foreign policy.

At that time, I stated my vigorous opposition to any rash attempt on the part of the United States to impose a unilateral military blockade on Red China at this time.

I send to the desk the text of my Harrisburg address, supplemented by additional comments which I made to the press yesterday when this issue came up for further discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that both items be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVEN KEYSTONES OF NONPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in Harrisburg, Pa., at Jewish Community Center, at 100th anniversary of the center movement in the United States on Sunday, January 16, 1955)

I welcome this opportunity to survey with you current and future problems of American foreign policy.

It is particularly appropriate to come to the capital of the great Keystone State on so constructive an occasion as this—to consider the strengthening of nonpartisan foreign policy.

I shall refer to seven keystones of a sound international program for the United States—an enlightened modern program in this age of great challenge from international communism; this age of great opportunity; this contracted world of the jet-atomic era.

JUDGING STATESMEN OR DEMAGOGS

It seems to me that our fundamental mission in international relations is to construct keystones of peace and justice and prosperity.

It seems to me that the one great standard by which you or I should judge those who are active in the field of foreign affairs at home and abroad is this:

Have they, like statesmen, built for better relations? Or have they, like demagogues, tried to tear down the edifice of better relations?

Have they planted good will in the hearts of men?—America for her allies, and her allies for America?—good will for us in the

more than 1 billion hearts of the uncommitted segment of the world? Or have they planted seeds of discord, poisonous dragons' teeth of hatred?

Have they contributed to a better, more rational, more clear-cut understanding of the difficult, complex problems of our time? Or have they—in the chronic habit of the demagog—served to becloud issues, inflame them with emotional fury, so that problems become more and more difficult to solve?

These are questions by which you or I or anyone else should judge not only the men in public life who work on foreign affairs, but individuals in private life who also participate in this crucial subject.

SECRETARY OF STATE'S NOTABLE SUCCESSES

With that standard, you and I are going to look at all the world's stage.

If time permitted, I would have liked to consider in detail some of the great advances which have been made during the past couple of years.

They represent successes which already assure for our distinguished Secretary of State an enduring mark in history as one of the greatest men who has ever held this high office.

I refer to such notable achievements as the settling of the Italian-Yugoslav dispute over Trieste; the English-Egyptian agreement on the Suez Canal problem; the settlement of the Anglo-Iranian oil dispute; the independent replacement of the Communist-dominated Government of Guatemala by a strong, able government representative of the will of those fine people; the great milestone represented in the Manila Pact; the very encouraging progress toward bringing into being of the new Western European Union; our mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China; and other impressive advances.

OTHER PROMISING FIELDS OF ACTION

I would have liked to discuss with you some of the current phases of our foreign policy program which are particularly promising.

One such program is the President's famous atoms-for-peace plan. It is one of the most promising of all suggestions for helping to resolve East-West tensions and to assure cooperation within the free world as well.

I should have liked to refer to the vital mission of our United States Information Agency which is doing such a fine job in our battle for the minds of men throughout the world—a peaceful battle using instruments of radio, press, motion pictures, and, yes, television.

In that latter connection, may I point out that in the last Congress, steps were taken toward the setting up of an International Telecommunications Commission, one of whose phases would be the development of international television. Action, unfortunately, was not completed by the Congress, although important spadework has been performed by an intra-Cabinet committee. I am hoping that the 84th Congress will flash the green light for international TV through the proposed Commission.

The use of the miracle medium of television throughout the world offers dramatic possibilities, particularly for dispelling lies and misunderstanding, generated by the Soviet Union against the free world.

DANGER SPOTS ON WORLD SCENE

And, too, if time permitted, I would have liked to take a detailed look at some of the specific danger spots in the world, particularly some of the scenes where force of arms is still the order of the day: Like the guerrilla war in Malaya; the border strife in the Holy Land; Mau Mau terrorism in Kenya; the fighting in Costa Rica; the air and sea strikes to and from Formosa and the Chinese mainland.

I would have liked us to consider problems which do not now involve clash of arms, but which represent sources of deep concern to us like the problems in southern Vietnam and elsewhere in southeast Asia; problems along the uneasy border of our devoted ally, the Republic of Korea.

But time does not permit us to look in detail at each of these specific phases, and so I should like to turn to some of the more general principles which do apply throughout the world. They are principles which will serve as guides to us in weighing the future foreign policy of our country.

SEVEN BUILDING BLOCKS FOR PEACE

I should like to refer to 7 keystones—7 building blocks for an effective foreign policy: They are, as I see them: (1) Nonpartisanship, (2) vision, (3) good will, (4) patience, (5) restraint, (6) partnership, and (7) spirituality.

NONPARTISANSHIP ESSENTIAL IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The first keystone is nonpartisanship.

Without this keystone, we cannot possibly speak with one clear, eloquent, firm voice to the world.

But, fortunately, we are going to continue to do so.

And so, I want to pay tribute now to the responsible leaders of both our major political parties who will help assure continuing nonpartisanship, notwithstanding the overall political division between the executive and legislative branches.

The relatively smooth transition of legislative control is, in my judgment a remarkable commentary on the vitality and worth of our two-party system.

Here too, in Harrisburg, next Tuesday you will be inaugurating a new Democratic Governor. Your new legislature will in turn be divided—with each of the parties in control of one Chamber.

You look forward however to responsible two-party government, I am sure.

In Washington, we have already had our legislative transition. Just 3 days ago, at its first meeting the Senate Foreign Relations Committee formally changed hands, as have all the other committees on Capitol Hill.

The particular smoothness with which this transition was made in our own committee was, I believe, an inspiring demonstration of responsible party and individual leadership.

In this crucial field of foreign affairs there is (on both sides of Capitol Hill) going to be basic continuity, I am happy to say. There may, to be sure, be some changes, as the new majority exercises its prerogative of review. But in the broad outline of past and current foreign policy, in the basic attitude of full and wholehearted cooperation with the executive branch, I am delighted that there is going to be sincere and cordial continuity. There is continuity in staff. There is continuity in teamwork.

At our committee helm, a Republican Senator from the Midwest has been replaced by a Democratic Senator from the southland, the esteemed Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia. Your speaker tonight was and is succeeded by this distinguished American, who has served in the Senate—as one of its most universally respected statesmen—who has done so longer than any other present man of that great body and who is now honored by serving as its President pro tempore.

I, in turn, who have been pleased to serve longer than any other current Republican but one—Senator BRIDGES—am honored to serve with Senator GEORGE and with a group of fine men which includes—as a neophyte, as a freshman for this Congress—the beloved Veep, our former Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY.

From men such as these and from our other associates, you can anticipate—with pleasure—the most responsible form of nonpartisan cooperation in foreign affairs.

VISION NEEDED TO BUILD THE PEACE

We turn to the second keystone.

In the Book of Proverbs, we read that "without vision a people perish."

Never has that been truer than in the dangerous world of the atomic-jet age. Without vision, as to the defense needs of our Nation, the economic-political, spiritual needs, this Nation could not survive.

Without such vision, indeed, this Nation could never have been born. But, 170 years ago the Founding Fathers had a vision—of a constitutional Republic, a Nation of checks and balances, of separation of powers. And they had the courage and perseverance to bring that vision into being.

In our own time, far-sighted men had the vision of establishing a United Nations. It was to be an organization which would achieve goals which neither the League of Nations nor any previous similar effort in history had ever attained: the goal of a world of lasting law and order, of enduring peace and justice. And great progress has been made in this noble United Nations organization.

AN ILLUSTRATION OF VISION: UNICEF

And men had other visions as well. They had the vision of a United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund which would tend the innocent little victims of war and of poverty and disease.

UNICEF, founded in 1946, now operates in 80 countries. Its services are estimated to have reached 25 million children in 1954.

UNICEF surveys indicate that 600 million children, two-thirds of all those living, are without adequate food, clothing, shelter, sanitation, or minimum medical protection.

Millions of them will die in childhood or live warped lives for want of ordinary care. And to help meet this need, UNICEF (which is not a hand-out organization) draws contributions from nearly 100 countries and territories. It does so on a matching basis with the governments of the benefiting countries. Thus, it has provided vaccine for the inoculation of 30 million children; penicillin to cure 3 million children of yaws. It has protected more than 13 million against malaria. This work, it seems to me, is one of the most impressive illustrations of international humanitarian effort. Incidentally, it is backed unanimously by every member of the U. N.

In the not too distant future, a UNICEF movie made by the world-famous comedian, Danny Kaye, with the splendid cooperation of Paramount Pictures, will be released. It will afford another opportunity for men of good will everywhere to become better acquainted with this fine organization—this organization founded and administered by men and women of vision.

It was such men who are responsible, too, for the World Health Organization, which has done such outstanding work toward banishing epidemics and disease; the Food and Agricultural Organization, which has helped uplift farm production; the World Bank, which has helped assure credit for sound new enterprises.

And other men have had the vision to bring into being other vital parts of our system of collective security and international justice.

I refer, for example, to the Office for European Economic Cooperation and its 18 member nations—the Council of Europe, the pioneering Coal and Steel Community.

I refer to the builders of our worldwide system of defensive alliances—bilateral and multilateral—which have done so much to help achieve equilibrium in this troubled world.

Without this type of vision, our chances for peace would perish.

GOOD-WILL EMISSARIES NEEDED

I turn now to the third keystone—good will.

Here we need men and women who will build friendship, who will build warm understanding, who will combat the termites of racialism, chauvinism, provincialism.

We need men and women who will unite free men, irrespective of barriers of race and religion and nationality.

Fortunately, we have witnessed many fine examples of messengers of good will.

I am thinking now, for example, of the outstanding good-will trip which was made by the very competent brother of the Chief Executive of our country, Dr. Milton Eisenhower. It was a trip which inspired the people of Latin America. That trip was later successfully followed up by the work of Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Henry Holland, and by the efforts of Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey and Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, and others at the Inter-American Conference at Patropolis.

I am thinking, too, of the able work performed particularly in the Far East by the Vice President of the United States when he and his charming wife visited 19 countries and 2 Crown colonies in one of the most successful and fruitful such visits ever made by a high-ranking officer of our Nation.

I am confident that Dick Nixon's forthcoming trip to Central America, beginning on February 6, will be similarly productive of good will.

But harmony and good will are spread by private citizens as well. Hundreds of thousands of American tourists and servicemen traveling or living abroad, embodying courtesy, tact, and fellowship toward foreign peoples, contribute to this process.

Every American, too, who sends a CARE package to relieve foreign need, every American who writes a constructive letter to a friend or relative or business acquaintance beyond the seas, every American who attends a constructive international conference, such as the recent meeting in Vienna of the World Veterans Federation, or such as international church gatherings, fraternal, scientific, or other groups, dedicated to the cause of peace and freedom, can also serve to engender good will.

Likewise, I refer to every artist who serves to cement relations between our two peoples. I am thinking now, for example, of the spectacular success of the traveling troupe which has been presenting the folk opera, *Porgy and Bess*. This outstanding group of Negro artists has probably done more to dispel falsehoods about racial relations in the United States than an almost infinite amount of words on the part of diplomats.

I am thinking, too, of the great job which has been done by individual artists like the great Marian Anderson—in helping to establish a framework of good will for us throughout the world.

WE NEED PATIENCE, NOT ARBITRARY ACTION, TO RELEASE AIRMEN

The fourth building block is patience. This is one of the most difficult of all to achieve. It is often hard to be patient before injustice, before resisting international crime.

Such a crime has been committed in the imprisonment of 11 American airmen. There is no patriotic American who does not feel a burning moral indignation against this outrage.

And, yet, if we are to be true to the needs of these airmen; if we are to be true to the needs of our Nation and of the world, we must continue to explore every reasonable diplomatic channel through the United Nations for the orderly release of these men.

Naturally, we all regret that immediate release was not effected through the recent trip by the U. N. Secretary General. But the fact that it was not an immediate and complete success does not for one moment detract from the fact that it did effect progress toward our objective.

In any event, we must not rush into hasty ill-considered, impulsive action. I, for one, definitely and absolutely oppose at this time any arbitrary steps involving the use of force—such as a military blockade—to effect the release of these men. I particularly oppose any unilateral forceful action on our part at this time. Talks with Peiping are going to consume more time. But remember that the problem of these imprisoned airmen is related to the problem of other Americans—civilian and uniformed—whom we have very strong reason to believe are still unjustly imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain.

I say, there is too much of a tendency for some of us to become so aroused by a single incident that we forget the overall picture, that we forget that hasty ill-considered action could start a chain reaction leading to diplomatic-military complications of the direst sort.

Nothing that is very good in this world is accomplished overnight.

Rome was not built in a day, nor was this American Republic.

The United Nations is today less than 10 years old. It has been learning, evolving, experimenting the hard way as has every similar institution.

Look back to our own history and consider the difficult conditions which prevailed in this land when we, as a nation, were but 10 years old. Remember that more than a half-century after we were established as a nation, not only had we not succeeded in solving our problems, but we were engaged in a long and bloody War Between the States.

Why, then, should we be so impatient when we are dealing not only with the Reds but with other men who do not speak the same language nor share the same geographic area as ourselves, diverse men and 60 diverse nations throughout the world—nations which are at different strata of development, nations which have different cultural, historical, religious, and political outlooks?

Let us indeed, as President Eisenhower has so eloquently suggested, have the courage of patience.

THE COROLLARY OF RESTRAINT

Hand in hand with the building block of patience is the building block of restraint. We are the world's greatest power, but if we are to be the world's wisest power, we must play our role with restraint. The world will all the more respect us if we use our position with discretion and judgment.

Perhaps the best recent illustration of intelligent restraint came during the recent dangerous days when our ally France was debating the Western European Union in her National Assembly. That occasion afforded a remarkable illustration of United States self-restraint and Communist wildness.

On the one hand, our United States officials scrupulously refrained from either any word or deed which might in any way have been misconstrued as affecting the right of the French nation to decide its own course. On the other hand, the Kremlin ordered all sorts of threats, demonstrations, all sorts of propaganda, to try to stampede the French National Assembly into rejection of the pacts. But the Kremlin's efforts backfired, and France rose to the occasion and the Assembly ratified the WEU.

There will be other occasions when we must be similarly patient, similarly self-restrained.

One such occasion remains, of course, right now in connection with the problem of our imprisoned airmen.

The situation remains delicate. We will not be contributing to its solution if we fail to keep check on our emotions.

That does not imply weakness on our part. Actually, restraint is an act of strength. It does not mean timidity; restraint is an act of courage.

It does not mean softness toward communism. Anybody can easily hurl well-deserved epithets and denunciations at the Reds—in Peiping and Moscow. But it takes a man of character and judgment to work quietly for his objective, against the Reds, but through the appropriate means at the appropriate time.

WE WILL NOT APPEASE RED CHINA

Let there be no mistake.

We are not going to appease Red China or the U. S. S. R. We are not going to surrender to blackmail. We are not going to allow Red China to shoot her way or blackmail her way into the United Nations. We are not going to appease.

You may recall that when Neville Chamberlain flew to Germany in September 1938, that great prophet, Winston Churchill, remarked, "England has been offered a choice between war and shame. She has chosen shame, and she will get war."

We will never choose the course of shame. But neither will we choose a course of war if war can possibly be avoided, as we know it can.

Peace is our goal. Peace is our nature. Peace we will attain—with strength, with preparedness, but with restraint.

We approach now the two final keystones, as I see them, in the arch of peace.

TRUE PARTNERSHIP WITH EQUALS

The sixth keystone is genuine partnership.

We Americans must make up our minds that we are in this international picture as partners and, contrary to a few persons' ideas, not as commanders. As a matter of fact, we have never as a nation sought to order any nation around. We have sought to lead by inspiration, by the soundness of our position, by our willingness to sacrifice and respectfully to ask others to do likewise.

We are not going to arrogate unto ourselves all wisdom.

We are not going to try Atlaslike to hold up all the rest of the world. Every other free nation and group of nations must and will do its part.

One of the soundest features of the activity of our Secretary of State has been his clear recognition of the great contributions which foreign statesmen like Premier Mohammed Ali, of Pakistan, or President Magsaysay, of the Philippines, can make, have made, and will continue to make toward world peace and justice; the contributions which the statesmen of Europe similarly make.

At times, they will differ with us. But, as good partners, we will work with them and we will present the facts to them as we see them.

We will never try to order or boss them or anyone else around. It would not work, even if some people were so rash or blind as to recommend it to us. Some few Americans do unfortunately continue to seem to think we ought to adopt an "ordering" approach. But, they are wrong, they are in a very small minority; and they are completely unrepresentative of the sound thinking of the United States Government and of the American people as a whole.

I point out that the great neutral, uncommitted area of the world is especially not going to take orders from anyone. It is coming into its own. It is feeling its new strength. It has a right to have its position understood and to be given consideration. That we will do, and we in turn will ask that it join in its own enlightened self-interest in our partnership, in our team as sovereign equals.

SPIRITUALITY: THE GREATEST SOURCE OF POWER

And lastly, my friends, is the keystone of our spiritual strength. I need not elaborate on the fact that our greatest power is spiritual power—the rightness of our cause under God.

This power should never be underestimated, for it is the strongest power in the world.

CONCLUSION

It has been a pleasure to be with you this evening.

In this list of 7 keystones, I have not, of course, attempted to cover all of the necessary ingredients for a world of peace and justice and prosperity.

But I think that if we can develop these particular keystones, just as you have built this center, then our children and our children's children will say after us that "they did well of their responsibilities in their time."

SENATOR WILEY URGES SUPPORT OF EISENHOWER POSITION

(Statement by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

I want to emphasize that I remain 100 percent in favor of the patient position recommended by President Eisenhower and by Secretary of State Dulles who rightly oppose any rash unilateral action at this time to free our United States airmen.

I am convinced that the American people as a whole support the President's commonsense, restrained judgment and oppose any impulsive action such as a unilateral military blockade.

The chances are that for us to try to impose such a blockade at this time all by ourselves might (a) result in the immediate death of the airmen themselves; (b) cause neutral countries to unite against us and against the blockade; (c) cause a wide open split among our allies; (d) overcommit our available naval resources; (e) worst of all, possibly precipitate us into a war with Red China, which is probably just what the Kremlin desires.

Instead we must continue to explore every diplomatic channel available through the United Nations for the peaceful release of these men.

We must not allow our emotions to run away with us in our well-justified concern for our airmen. We must not let the Reds provoke us into an action which we might have deep cause to regret because of its possible backfiring against us.

Progress in Dairying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on January 13 the Secretary of Agriculture delivered an address on the campus of the University of Minnesota, during the 53d annual Farm and Home Week. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN DAIRYING

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Benson)

It is a genuine pleasure to participate in this 53d annual Farm and Home Week here on the campus of the University of Minnesota. I am deeply impressed by the important contribution that meetings such as this are making toward better understanding of our agricultural problems.

This occasion exemplifies the leadership which our educational institutions are taking in promoting group discussions and exchanges of ideas and information. I have long believed that research, education, and improved marketing practices offer the surest approach to our goal of a prosperous, stable, and free agriculture. It is encouraging to see that all of these steps are emphasized in your Farm and Home Week program.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this forum. For some time I have wished to talk frankly on several matters which are of major importance to Minnesota farmers. Your kind invitation to appear was doubly welcome for that reason.

Minnesota is fortunate in having the soils and climate which permit highly diversified farming operations. Only about 7½ percent of the cash receipts of farmers in this State come from the basic commodities which seem to get most of the attention in farm-policy discussions. Dairying, hogs, and cattle—in that order—provide the major sources of farm income here. The feeding of hogs and cattle has been relatively profitable during the past year. The dairy industry has undergone some serious readjustments. For that reason, I should like to talk primarily about this problem.

Sometimes it is necessary for us to look back to see how far we have come. Today I would ask you to look back for a moment—to the situation which faced the dairy industry of this Nation just 1 year ago.

Your Government was getting into the dairy business at an unprecedented rate. Milk production was booming toward new seasonal highs. Consumption was not only failing to keep pace but was trending dangerously downward, particularly in the case of butter. Surplus dairy products were piling up in Government storage at an alarming rate. The industry was being out-promoted by its competitors at every turn. Despite price supports at 90 percent of parity, net income of dairy farmers had declined by more than \$200 million from 1952 to 1953. The dairy industry was sick. There were ominous rumblings that Government might be forced to invoke production controls.

All in all, it was not a very pretty picture. But this was, nevertheless, the situation which faced us just one short year ago.

Confronted by these facts and a law which specifically directed me to fix dairy price supports at a level which would assure an adequate supply, I announced a reduction from 90 to 75 percent of parity for the marketing year beginning last April 1. This decision was not lightly made. It was reached only after long and careful consideration. I had no illusions as to its immediate popularity with many dairymen. Yet I believed then in all conscience, as I do today, that this adjustment—painful though it might be—was in the best, long-term interests of the Nation's dairymen.

May I say now that I received plenty of advice on this matter. Much of it was sound and most of it was well meant. I gave full thought to all suggestions but one. I ignored the warning that the action constituted political suicide.

Now, as we begin this new year, the time has arrived to take stock—to strike a sort of balance sheet—of the dairy situation since price-support levels were adjusted 9 months ago.

The first, and most impressive fact, is that milk production shows definite signs of leveling off. In December 1954, milk production was 1 percent below December of a year ago. Meanwhile, per capita consumption of dairy products is on the upturn. This is of vital importance to every dairyman in America. It means that the day is approaching when supply and demand will be brought into balance—not through a distasteful and uneconomic program of production controls but rather through increased use of the healthful dairy products which our people need.

Milk production during 1954 reached an estimated 124 billion pounds—a record total. The leveling-off process of recent months suggests that it will be about the same this year. At the same time, per capita consumption of butter increased by about 5 percent in 1954—a sharp reversal of the long-time downward trend. The average American also ate a fraction of a pound more cheese and drank a little more milk in 1954.

When we add to this the fact that our population growth provides about 2.7 million additional consumers each year, it becomes evident that we are rapidly bridging the gap between dairy supplies and demand. Even without any increase in per capita consumption of dairy products, this population growth alone provides a market for nearly 2 billion pounds of milk each year.

During 1954, milk consumption in all forms totaled about 118.5 billion pounds. If production during 1955 remains at the 1954 level—as we anticipate it will—our surplus of dairy products will be smaller than in either of the two preceding years. If the stepped-up promotional and merchandising campaigns of the dairy industry, which are beginning to show real results, meet our most optimistic expectations, we may well see an approximate balance between production and consumption by the latter part of this year.

When that happens—as it inevitably will if all of us are determined to see that it happens—prices of manufactured dairy products will move above the support level. The support price will no longer be the ceiling price, as has been the case too long.

I am convinced that every dairyman in the Nation would prefer that to a system which makes the Government the market and ties the future of the industry to a mere formula. I am convinced further that this day will dawn for dairymen much sooner because the dairy industry and this administration elected to face the facts and refused to bow to political expediency.

Allow me to cite a few figures which support the conclusion that we are headed in the right direction now:

In December—last month—the Government bought not a single pound of butter. This was the first full month in 2 years in which no purchases were made. During December of 1953 we bought more than 11 million pounds of butter and the heavy flow was just beginning.

During the final 3 months of 1954, butter purchases totaled only half a million pounds, as compared with 15 million a year earlier.

Government buying of cheese and nonfat dry milk has also declined sharply in recent months. Last month cheese purchases totaled about 1½ million pounds, compared with nearly 7 million for December of 1953. This was the smallest amount we had bought in any month for 2 years. We purchased 11.2 million pounds of dry milk in December 1954—less than one-third the amount of a year earlier—and the second smallest total acquired in any single month over a 2-year period. Only purchases for November were lower.

Normally I prefer not to incorporate many statistics in a speech. But figures sometimes tell an interesting story. With your indulgence, I should like to cite a few more because they represent good news for every segment of the dairy industry, for the Government itself, and for the public.

Less than 6 months ago, Commodity Credit Corporation had 466 million pounds of butter on hand. At the beginning of January this enormous hoard had been reduced to 266 million pounds. It is growing smaller by the day. This butter is moving into channels or consumption in the United States and abroad.

While it is true that most of these dispositions have been made at substantial losses, it is important that the butter is being used. It is also worth noting that nearly

20 million pounds of butter were resold into commercial-trade channels by CCC at prices which exceeded acquisition costs. Most of these sales were negotiated during the last 2 months. For the entire year of 1953, commercial-butter sales by CCC amounted to about 4 million pounds.

At the end of September 1954, CCC owned 435 million pounds of cheese. This inventory had been reduced by 100 million pounds by the year's end. Government sales of cheese in commercial-trade channels exceeded 116 million pounds in 1954, as compared with a bit more than 5 million pounds during the preceding year.

CCC had on hand 92 million pounds of dry milk at the beginning of this year. Eight months earlier the Government inventory stood at 600 million pounds.

Despite record-breaking purchases of dairy products during the early months of 1954, we bought less butter for the entire year than we did in 1953. Cheese and dry milk buying were up somewhat for the year but the trend during the final months of 1954 was sharply down.

Altogether, CCC disposed of approximately 1.5 billion pounds of dairy products last year, as compared with 352 million pounds in 1953; more than 4 times as much. About two-thirds of the butter and one-half of the cheese was moved after August 1, when Congress gave us broadened authority to deal with the entire surplus problem. Most of the dry milk was sold at substantial discount for use in mixed poultry and livestock feed.

Surplus butter holdings were distributed principally as domestic and foreign donations through school-lunch programs, church and welfare organizations, and charitable institutions. Millions of needy persons here and abroad shared in these donations. Some direct sales were made at reduced prices to foreign governments and United Nations agencies. Further distribution was made through Foreign Operations Administration activities. These various outlets absorbed 264 million pounds of butter in 1954, as against about 100 million pounds for the preceding year.

In addition, the Department of the Army obtained more than 28 million pounds of butter from CCC stocks in 1954, nearly double the amount for 1953. We sold butter for use as a cocoa butter extender and for liquid milk recombining abroad. Butter was also made available to the Veterans' Administration. None of these outlets was employed during the preceding year.

School-lunch donations and welfare distribution at home and abroad accounted for the movement of 161 million pounds of cheese in 1954, approximately 5 times the total of a year earlier. At the same time 400 million pounds of dry milk, more than double the amount for 1953, went into these programs last year.

The effect of these overall disposal efforts, combined with the increased commercial demand for dairy products, is reflected in improved milk prices during recent months. For the final quarter of 1954 wholesale prices received by farmers for all milk averaged 86 percent of parity, the same as in March of 1954, when price supports were still at 90 percent of parity. Seasonal factors, as well as our improved supply position, are partly responsible for this strength. If we can come this far in the space of a few months, there is every reason to be optimistic about the future of the dairy industry.

In fact, I find that optimism shared by many dairymen with whom I have talked and by representatives of other segments of the industry. They believe, as I do, that we have yet to see the full effects of the aggressive merchandising and promotional campaigns which have been steadily building up for several months. They know they have the finest food product in the world to sell—and at a bargain price. They know that

there is a vast untapped market for this most nearly perfect food right here in America and they are determined to reach it.

The story of milk is being told today far better than it has in the past—through every conceivable advertising medium. The dairy industry is successfully employing many of the promotional tactics of its competitors. Its leaders have also recognized that there are two important steps in merchandising. First, to create a desire for the product, and second, to make it readily available everywhere.

It's rather sad, but nevertheless true, that it's far easier for many Americans to buy a bottle of pop or even an alcoholic beverage than just a plain drink of milk. In my travels over the country—waiting in airports and railway stations—I find that I can purchase candy, chewing gum, a variety of carbonated beverages—I can even insure my life or test my skill on a pinball machine—all by simply inserting a coin in a slot. But I can't buy milk with the same ease.

Why until a few months ago—even in the Department of Agriculture, where lights burned late as we sweated over the dairy problem—you couldn't buy a drink of milk except in the cafeterias at certain hours. You can now. You can also buy milk in thousands of other places where it wasn't available until the dairy industry got its promotional campaign in gear.

We have had a magnificent response—here in Minnesota and elsewhere—to the new program approved by Congress which makes an additional \$50 million available this year and next for an expanded school lunch milk program. The armed services are cooperating in a move to increase the use of milk and other dairy products. These efforts represent more than a current contribution to the better health of our young people. They create the milk-drinking habit. They build markets for tomorrow as well as for today.

I have sought here to summarize what I regard as definite advances on the dairy front during this marketing year. The various facts and figures which I have detailed represent an impressive total on the credit side of the ledger. They indicate clearly that we are on the right road.

At the same time, I would not create the impression that all of our problems are behind us. As our continuing, though greatly reduced, purchases of cheese and dry milk indicate, production is still outrunning demand. The flush season is ahead of us. It will be little short of a miracle if the Government is not called upon to increase its dairy support purchase program over the next few months. Yet I am confident that what buying we are forced to do will be on a much smaller scale than it was during this period in 1954. That situation, as it develops, will be further important evidence of the fact that we are clearly emerging from the serious crisis which gripped the industry such a short time ago.

I am not unmindful that dairy producers are caught in a perplexing price-cost squeeze. While final figures are not yet available, it is expected that they will show net income of dairy producers in 1954 was down some \$180 million to \$200 million from the preceding year, a decline of about 4 percent. Disturbing as this must be to all of us, it might be pointed out that dairy income declined even more between 1952 and 1953, despite supports at 90 percent of parity. To me this strongly suggests that the continuation of high level supports was not the answer, as some people have argued. If it were, the problem would never have developed.

I would rather think of the loss in dairy income as the industry's share of the cost of getting back on a sound foundation. The Government's share of that cost has been even greater. I do not regard either the industry's or the Government's contribution as an outright loss, however. Rather it is an

investment in the future of dairying—an investment which will be returned many times in the years ahead if we have the courage and the determination to see this crisis through.

However much some individual dairymen may be pinched by the decline in income, they might well consider what their plight could have been had 90 percent supports been continued. Producers of the basic commodities who have been receiving price supports at that level have also been forced to take drastic production controls. In neighboring North Dakota, for example, 1954 wheat acreage was cut 20 percent below 1953. It will be reduced again in 1955.

I am sure Minnesota dairy producers are thankful they are not faced with that kind of a production slash. High level price supports inevitably breed production controls. We have them this year on every one of the six basic commodities. To argue that dairying could somehow have escaped a similar fate—had maximum supports been continued—is to deny the very plain evidence to the contrary. As one who was engaged in dairying for many years, I might add my conviction that farmers would be no happier under milk production controls than I would be in administering them.

As every dairyman knows, his business is particularly sensitive to the factor of volume. His constant objective is increased production at reduced cost. He knows through hard, practical experience that a drop in production can hurt him just as much as a drop in price. Virtually every advance in dairying efficiency, on the farm and in the plant, is geared to large production. The careful upgrading of the dairyman's herd, the improvements in his feeding and milking operations, the better techniques in handling and transporting his milk are all primarily directed toward large volume marketing.

Farmers in our principal dairying regions might well consider another effect of production controls upon their operations. Any attempt to impose such restrictions by law would almost certainly be accompanied by a move to exempt small producers—just as they are exempted from the control provisions of some basic crop programs. The backyard producer—the 1 and 2 cow owner—would be permitted to operate as before, because of the tremendous obstacles involved in the enforcement of milk production controls.

Nearly 29 percent of all farms producing milk have only 1 cow. Seventeen percent have only two cows. Sixteen percent have either 3 or 4 cows. Thus, it would seem to be a fair guess that perhaps half of the farms producing milk would be exempt from production controls. The full burden would fall upon the larger and more efficient producers. Productionwise, if only 1- and 2-cow farms were outside the program, about 11 percent of the milk produced in this country would be completely unaffected by controls.

There is nothing startling about the fact that the dairy industry is adjusting to new conditions and situations. Such adjustments are constantly taking place—and, to a considerable extent, independently of prevailing milk prices.

For example, between 1944 and 1949—when prices of milk and butterfat averaged above 100 percent of parity—the number of farms producing dairy products for the market in this country declined by 19 percent. Yet the change in total milk production was less than 1 percent. The sharpest drop occurred on farms with less than 10 cows. In Pennsylvania, 25 years ago, 47 percent of the total production came from herds of 9 cows or less. Today, in that State, only 18 percent of the milk comes from herds of that size.

There is a wide variation in dairy production costs in different areas of this broad Nation. There are even notable spreads

among farms in the same area. One recent study in Pennsylvania revealed milk production costs ranging from \$3.50 per hundred to as much as \$9.50. I believe we need to ask ourselves whether we want an economic system that permits a producer with such almost unbelievable costs to provide our milk.

As all dairymen know, labor represents a large element of cost. Through the years the great emphasis has been upon obtaining increased production per cow and, with this, greater labor efficiency. To be more efficient, the dairyman need not necessarily work harder, faster, and longer. Rather the goal is to accomplish more, with less back-bending effort in a short time through planning, know-how, and labor-saving devices.

A survey by the Agricultural Experiment Station at Michigan State College pointed out opportunities for reducing milk-production costs by 45 percent, through the use of all available techniques and adjustments. This was done without increasing either the number of workers or the farm acreage. Gains were made primarily through the use of better-producing cows and improved practices.

Now, of course, not every dairyman can achieve such an increase in efficiency. Many producers are already using most of the techniques employed in this test. But even they may increase operating efficiency and profits by using all of the available know-how—the better breeds, feeds, and seeds and improved production practices. The dairyman who achieves only a part of the increased efficiency attained in the Michigan State test can offset the adjustment in price supports. It is still true in dairying, as in other segments of agriculture, that the individual farmer can do more for himself than Government can ever do for him.

Many would-be political leaders have been using high, fixed price supports as a smoke-screen to cover up one indisputable fact—the fact that it was the unprecedented demands of war, together with inflation, that kept farm prices high during the 10 years following Pearl Harbor. The parity ratio averaged between 100 and 115 during those years. Actually, it was ceilings fixed by law at the top—not the 90-percent floor below—which set farm prices. Every farmer knows he would have received even more for his products during this period had there been neither ceilings nor price supports.

It has been apparent for some time that high, rigid, emergency supports were not the solution to our peacetime agricultural problems. These current problems have all developed under high, rigid price supports which remain in effect until the 1955 harvest. If farmers have experienced reduced prices and incomes, these reductions occurred under the old law which was supposed to prevent them.

There is nothing new or revolutionary about flexible price supports. They have been a part of our agricultural programs for nearly two decades. They have been endorsed at one time or another by every Secretary of Agriculture for 20 years, by the former occupant of the White House, and by both major parties.

The financial pangs which go with readjustment to a peacetime economy are not new to agriculture. We have suffered them following every war in our history. Just as farm commodity prices go up faster than the general price level under the stimulus of war and inflation, they also drop further and faster than most non-farm prices while the economy is readjusting to more nearly normal conditions. We are making the transition this time with fewer and less severe dislocations in agriculture and other segments of our economy than ever before.

The depression which was so freely predicted a year ago failed to materialize. From an economic point of view, 1954 proved to be the best peacetime year in

history, although agriculture did not fully share in this prosperity. The changeover has hurt and is hurting most of our farm people.

Yet I believe all of the evidence indicates we have seen the worst. I am convinced that for agriculture the road ahead will be smoother than the one we have been traveling.

For several months now, most farm prices have been relatively stable. For the last 2 years, in fact, the parity ratio has averaged about 90, fluctuating narrowly between 94 and 86. It will be recalled that there was a 19 point plunge in the parity ratio during the 2 years preceding January 1953, when the new administration was installed.

We must not be content with mere stability of farm prices at current levels. But the price decline had to be halted before it could be reversed. The first half of that objective is being attained. The job at hand now is to get farm prices back into better balance with the general price level. This, I am confident, can be done under the Agricultural Act of 1954 which has as its goal a prosperous, stable and free agriculture.

Today I pledge anew to you and to all of our farm people that I will never knowingly sponsor or support any policy or program which I believe is not in the best interests of our farmers and all of our people, regardless of political pressure.

As the President pointed out in his state of the Union message: "Agricultural programs have been redirected toward better balance, greater stability and sustained prosperity. We are headed in the right direction. I urgently recommend to Congress that we continue resolutely on this road."

Now if I may leave one final thought with you, it is this: The future of American agriculture is bright—as bright as all of us have the will to make it. A kind Providence has blessed this choice land with vast natural resources—with soils and climate which, with American ingenuity, courage and freedom, have provided a standard of living unmatched elsewhere. May God guide us in the wise use of our abundance.

**Statement by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss,
Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

This is in connection with the heading of an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Friday, January 14, 1955, entitled "How Admiral Strauss Doctored History."

This headline was withdrawn from later editions.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., January 17, 1955.

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,

The United States Senate,

Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Following our telephone conversation on Friday, January 14,

concerning the speech by Senator GORE, I promised to send you a factual account of the incident to which he referred.

The Washington Daily News on Friday published an article which was advertised by a front page headline in its early issue "How Admiral Strauss Doctoring History." This article, in disregard of the facts, alleged that I caused the transcript of a news conference which I held on December 17 to be falsified for some improper reason. I am informed the headline was withdrawn in later editions.

The news conference was called for the purpose of explaining, in an orderly, detailed, comprehensive manner, the origin and provisions of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. contract in order to put into proper perspective the misunderstandings which have been current concerning it. Each reporter who entered the conference room was given a formal, written statement of 36 pages, bearing my name; also reproductions of the charts, graphs, and tabulations dealing with the subject which were exhibited during the conference.

In my formal statement, pages 10 and 11, I discussed the manner in which the site at West Memphis, Ark., was selected and stated:

"The Corps of Engineers has reviewed the plot plan showing the proposed construction and made certain suggestions, all of which we are assured will be complied with in the final plans and specifications. They also have stated that the proposed construction appears to be acceptable to the Mississippi River Commission from the standpoint of navigation and flood control. The site also has been

investigated by AEC engineers, has been discussed by them with representatives of the Corps of Engineers' office, Memphis district. They concluded, after reviewing all available data, that the site selected by MVGC is adequately protected from Mississippi River floods by the Corps of Engineers project levee."

The precise and factual account of the role of the Corps of Engineers was given to the reporters not only in my formal statement but also in two of the supplemental documents which accompanied the statement: (1) a reproduction of a drawing of the site which carried an inserted legend of explanation, and (2) a statement as to the manner in which the site was selected, including discussions which were held among AEC engineers, engineers of the sponsoring companies, and the Corps of Engineers.

After the 56 reporters attending the conference had received my formal statement, I turned to a large reproduction of the site drawing which had been affixed to the wall and mentioned again how the site had been chosen but this was only a passing reference, ad lib, since the subject had been covered thoroughly in the formal statement.

The ad lib quotation was as follows:

"The Corps of Engineers and the engineers retained by sponsoring companies have examined some 16 sites on the river and have selected this as the preferable one. This elevation here shows the maximum flood record in the river, the 1937 flood. I understand that records have been made since 1880 or thereabouts, some 74 years of

record, and the plant has been located at what the Corps of Engineers feel is a safe place."

In this quotation, an obvious slip of the tongue was recognized as such by all except one or two of the fifty-six reporters present since in reporting the news conference they naturally relied on the prepared statement.

I left town following the news conference but in my absence the Public Information Division of the Commission corrected the stenographic transcript for grammatical errors, et cetera, and in the course of this process the transcript was conformed to the text of the formal statement. This was done in order to eliminate anything that might appear to be a contradiction. Any person speaking ad libitum, whether he be a Member of Congress, a witness before a committee, or a person conducting a news conference, is entitled to the assurance that the intent of his statements will be clearly reflected in a simultaneously presented written record.

These facts as I have stated them were ignored in the newspaper article and which purported to show that I had "doctored history," presumably for some insidious reasons. There was no word in the article about my formal 36-page statement, which is factually accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I may be unduly sensitive but it seems to me that this whole incident has very little to do with the merits of the controversy over the contract.

Faithfully yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Archbishop John Theodorovich, metropolitan of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the United States, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, let us pray.

Almighty God, Thou art father of all nations, the source of the mighty stream of life in which the forward flow is humanity. Thou gavest to our Nation to become a mighty wave in the stream of humanity. Grant us, our Father, to remember we are a hope for many engulfed with the waves of oppression. There are the enslavers of the nations hiding the shame of slavery in our time behind the iron curtains.

Have mercy, O Lord, on these victims of mass execution, exile, slave camps, starvation. Have mercy on Thy ministers, tortured and killed for Thy name's sake. Grant the nations crushed under the tyrant's heel the blessings of liberty, independence, and national statehood.

Give our great Nation the strength and courage to keep bright the beacon of liberty and justice. Give us the wisdom to help our brothers in Ukraine and all the other suppressed nations striving for freedom and national independence.

May the day come, O God, when all nations and peoples shall live in a true state of coexistence devoid of iron curtains and tyrants and slavery. And grant that all men may live in their own lands in liberty and independence under their own governments in Thy ways and according to Thy will.

May Thy kingdom come. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 17, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 20, 1955.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on January 17, 1955, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 19, 1955, the following messages:

That the Senate has passed with amendments the bill H. R. 2091, entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill H. R. 2091 and requests a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JANUARY 18, 1955.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

Sir: Pursuant to authority granted on January 17, 1955, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 18, 1955, the following message:

That the Senate has passed without amendment the bill H. R. 2369, entitled "An

act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, January 17, 1955, he did on January 18, 1955, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H. R. 2369. An act to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

And the following enrolled joint resolution of the Senate:

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 15, section 1024, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following members on the part of the House: Mr. PATMAN of Texas, Mr. BOLLING of Missouri, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLCOTT of Michigan, Mr. TALLE of Iowa, and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.